REMARKS

The Office Action mailed June 3, 2004 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 13-20 are now pending in this application. Claims 13-20 stand rejected. Claims 1-12 are cancelled.

Reconsideration of the restriction requirement imposed under 35 U.S.C. § 121 is respectfully requested. Specifically, a restriction to either invention I, consisting of claims 6-12 drawn to a receptacle, classified in Class 470, subclass 18, or invention II, consisting of claims 13-20, drawn to a gas turbine thrust link, classified in class 60, subclass 797, was imposed. In response, Applicant confirms the election with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group II, claims 13-20.

The requirement for election is traversed because the inventions set out by the claims in Groups I and II are clearly related. Applicant submits that a thorough search and examination of either Group would be relevant to the examination of the other Group and would not be a serious burden on the Examiner. Additionally, requirements for election are not mandatory under 35 U.S.C. 121.

The objection to Claims 16 and 18-20 due to an informality is respectfully traversed. Specifically, Claims 16 and 18-20 have each been amended as suggested by the Examiner. For the reasons set forth above, Applicant requests that the objection to Claims 16 and 18-20 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 12-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Snyder et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,357,220) ("Snyder") in view of either Corrette (U.S. Patent No. 4,408,418) or Fredd (U.S. Patent No. 4,117,563) is respectfully traversed.

Snyder describes a mount 60 for a gearbox accessory 40 for a gas turbine engine 10. Mount 60 includes a mounting plate 62 having attachment points for a first link 64 and a second link 66 that attach at a first end to first and second brackets 68 and 70, respectively. First link 64 includes a clevis 78 threadably mounted to a second end of first link 64. Clevis 78 includes an opening for pivotably coupling to mounting plate 62 by means of a bolt 79.

Corrette describes a through-feed rolling of a workpiece 10 with cylindrical through-feed rolling dies 11 and 12. Dies 11 and 12 are formed with a lead-in taper portion 13, a uniform dwell portion 17, and an exit taper portion 19. In use, workpiece 10 feeds into dies 11 and 12 and moves along lead-in taper portion 13 such that a thread is progressively formed on the surface of workpiece 10. When workpiece reaches dwell portion 17, the threads are substantially fully formed and substantially fill the thread forms on dies 11 and 12. Workpeice 10 then moves along exit taper portion 19. Additionally, the crest spacing or pitch of the threads on dies 11 and 12 are uniformly maintained throughout the length of dies 11 and 12 so that a thread shift is not produced at the end of dwell portion 17 where it joins taper portions 13 and 19.

Fredd describes a thread chaser tool 58 for cutting thread forms in a tubular member 37 having both straight threads 39 and tapered threads 40. Tool 58 includes a cutting edge that is defined by two symmetrical points having tip radii 5 that are spaced apart less than the pitch of a thread to be cut. The thread form is generated by the inside flanks 6 and 8 of each point and a crestforming radius 7 therebetween.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Section 103 rejection of the presently pending claims is not a proper rejection. As is well established, obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the cited art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive supporting the combination. None of Snyder, Corrette and Fredd, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest the claimed combination. Furthermore, in contrast to the assertion within the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that it would not be obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Snyder with Corrette or Fredd, because there is no motivation to combine the references suggested in the art. Additionally, the Examiner has not pointed to any prior art that teaches or suggests to combine the disclosures, other than Applicant's own teaching. Rather, only the conclusory statement that "it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a cutback, as taught by either Corrette or Fredd, to enhance the threaded connection of Snyder..." suggests combining the disclosures.

As the Federal Circuit has recognized, obviousness is not established merely by combining references having different individual elements of pending claims. Ex parte Levengood, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1300 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993). MPEP 2143.01. Rather, there must be some suggestion, outside of Applicant's disclosure, in the prior art to combine such references, and a reasonable expectation of success must be both found in the prior art, and not based on Applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck , 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1436 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In the present case, neither a suggestion or motivation to combine the prior art disclosures, nor any reasonable expectation of success has been shown.

Furthermore, it is impermissible to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or "template" to piece together the teachings of the cited art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious. Specifically, one cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the art to deprecate the claimed invention. Further, it is impermissible to pick and choose from any one reference only so much of it as will support a given position, to the exclusion of other parts necessary to the full appreciation of what such reference fairly suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art. The present Section 103 rejection is based on a combination of teachings selected from multiple patents in an attempt to arrive at the claimed invention. Specifically, Snyder is cited for its teaching of a gas turbine engine including a link having an opening in a clevis through which a threaded bolt is coupled, Corrette is merely cited for its teaching a plurality of threads including a cutback, and Fredd is merely cited for its teaching of a plurality of threads including a cutback. Since there is no teaching nor suggestion in the cited art for the combination, the Section 103 rejection appears to be based on a hindsight reconstruction in which isolated disclosures have been picked and chosen in an attempt to deprecate the present invention. Of course, such a combination is impermissible, and for this reason alone, Applicant requests that the Section 103 rejection be withdrawn.

In addition, as is well established, obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the cited art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive supporting the combination. None of Snyder, Corrette and Fredd, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a thrust link connector including an inner surface having a plurality of threads extending radially outward into a connector opening such that the threads are axially spaced substantially constant along the inner surface, wherein the plurality of threads include a first thread portion positioned proximate the first side and initially engaging a threaded apparatus coupled to the connector, and wherein the plurality of threads include a cutback that extends through the first thread portion.

If art "teaches away" from a claimed invention, such a teaching supports the nonobviousness of the invention. U.S. v. Adams, 148 USPQ 479 (1966); Gillette Co. v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc., 16 USPQ2d 1923, 1927 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In light of this standard, it is respectfully submitted that the cited are, as a whole, is not suggestive of the presently claimed invention. Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that Snyder teaches away from both Corrette and Fredd and the present invention, and as such, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Snyder with either Corrette or Fredd. Specifically, Snyder describes a mount for a gearbox accessory that includes a link having a clevis threadably coupled to an end of the link, wherein the clevis includes an opening for receiving a mounting plate therein, and a bolt hole for receiving a bolt to attach the clevis to the mounting plate, Corrette describes a through-feed rolling of a workpiece with cylindrical through-feed rolling dies formed with threads extending from a lead-in taper portion, a uniform dwell portion, and an exit taper portion, and Fredd describes a thread chaser tool for cutting thread forms in a tubular member having both straight threads and tapered threads. In addition, none of Snyder, Corrette and Fredd describe or suggest a thrust link connector including an inner surface having a plurality of threads extending radially outward into a connector opening such that the threads are axially spaced substantially constant along the inner surface, wherein the plurality of threads include a first thread portion positioned proximate the first side and initially engaging a threaded apparatus coupled to the connector, and wherein the plurality of threads include a cutback that extends through the first thread portion.

Moreover, and to the extent understood, none of Snyder, Corrette and Fredd describe or suggest the claimed invention. Specifically, Claim 13 recites "a gas turbine engine comprising a thrust link comprising a first connector, a second connector, and a span section extending therebetween, each said thrust link connector comprising a first side, a second side, and an opening extending therebetween and defined by an inner surface, said inner surface comprising a plurality of threads extending radially outward into said connector opening such that said threads are axially spaced substantially constant along said inner surface, said plurality of threads comprises a first thread portion positioned proximate said first side and initially engaging a threaded apparatus coupled to said connector, said plurality of threads comprising a cutback configured to reduce stresses induced into said plurality of threads wherein said cutback extends through said first thread portion."

None of Snyder, Corrette and Fredd, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a gas turbine engine as recited in Claim 13. More specifically, none of Snyder, Corrette and Fredd, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a thrust link connector including an inner surface having a plurality of threads extending radially outward into a connector opening such that the threads are axially spaced substantially constant along the inner surface, wherein the plurality of threads include a first thread portion positioned proximate the first side and initially engaging a threaded apparatus coupled to the connector, and wherein the plurality of threads include a cutback that extends through the first thread portion. Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Snyder describes a mount for a gearbox accessory that includes a link having a clevis threadably coupled to an end of the link, wherein the clevis includes an opening for receiving a mounting plate therein, and a bolt hole for receiving a bolt to attach the clevis to the mounting plate, Corrette describes a through-feed rolling of a workpiece with cylindrical through-feed rolling dies formed with threads extending from a lead-in taper portion, a uniform dwell portion, and an exit taper portion, and Fredd describes a thread chaser tool for cutting thread forms in a tubular member having both straight threads and tapered threads. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 13 is submitted to be patentable over Snyder in view of either Corrette or Fredd.

Claims 14-20 depend from independent Claim 13. When the recitations of Claims 14-20 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 13, Applicant submits that dependent Claims 14-20 likewise are patentable over Snyder in view of either Corrette or Fredd.

The rejection of Claims 12-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Snyder et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,357,220) ("Snyder") in view of either Bonstein (U.S. Patent No. 5,014,411) or Sugimura (U.S. Patent No. 4,958,973) is respectfully traversed.

Snyder is described above. Bonstein describes a lock nut 10 that is formed by extending a substantially cylindrical bore 17 through a nut blank 11 to form a plurality of substantially-identical threads 22 therein. More specifically, as bore 17 is tapped, a diameter of the thread roots 25 tapers from an outer end 16 of threads 22 to an entrance end 15 of threads 22. Additionally, a pitch diameter 23 of threads 22 tapers at an included angle of 1° to 2°, or at a half angle 24 of 0.5° to 1°. A crest 27 of each thread 22 is truncated.

Sugimura describes a vessel body 10 that is formed with an internal-pressure bearing female screw 20 that includes a plurality of female screw threads FS formed with a constant axial spacing along female screw 20. More specifically, female screw threads FS have an identical height from a first screw thread FS10 adjacent a tip of body 10 to an intermediate thread FS8 that is an axial distance from the body tip. A cutback, defined by an oblique angle (ÿ), is formed through a plurality of the threadforms FS1-FS7 such that thread FS1 has a thread height L that is less than the thread height L of thread FS7 defined at the cutback opposite end. Thread FS7 is adjacent to thread FS8. Notably, Sugimura does not describe nor suggest a female threadform wherein the male threaded component is rotated within the female threadform to initially engage a first thread defined by the cutback.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Section 103 rejection of the presently pending claims is not a proper rejection. As is well established, obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the cited art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive supporting the combination. None of Snyder, Bonstein and

Sugimura, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest the claimed combination. Furthermore, in contrast to the assertion within the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that it would not be obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Snyder with Bonstein or Sugimura, because there is no motivation to combine the references suggested in the art. Additionally, the Examiner has not pointed to any prior art that teaches or suggests to combine the disclosures, other than Applicant's own teaching. Rather, only the conclusory statement that "it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a cutback, as taught by either Bonstein or Sugimura, to enhance the threaded connection of Snyder..." suggests combining the disclosures.

As the Federal Circuit has recognized, obviousness is not established merely by combining references having different individual elements of pending claims. Ex parte Levengood, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1300 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993). MPEP 2143.01. Rather, there must be some suggestion, outside of Applicant's disclosure, in the prior art to combine such references, and a reasonable expectation of success must be both found in the prior art, and not based on Applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck , 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1436 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In the present case, neither a suggestion or motivation to combine the prior art disclosures, nor any reasonable expectation of success has been shown.

Furthermore, it is impermissible to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or "template" to piece together the teachings of the cited art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious. Specifically, one cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the art to deprecate the claimed invention. Further, it is impermissible to pick and choose from any one reference only so much of it as will support a given position, to the exclusion of other parts necessary to the full appreciation of what such reference fairly suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art. The present Section 103 rejection is based on a combination of teachings selected from multiple patents in an attempt to arrive at the claimed invention. Specifically, Snyder is cited for its teaching of a gas turbine engine including a link having an opening in a clevis through which a threaded bolt is coupled, Bonstein is merely cited for its teaching a plurality of threads including a cutback, and Sugimura is merely cited for its teaching of a plurality of threads including a cutback. Since there is no teaching nor suggestion in the cited art for the combination, the Section 103 rejection appears to be based on a hindsight reconstruction in which isolated disclosures have been picked and chosen in an attempt to deprecate the present invention. Of course, such a combination is impermissible, and for this reason alone, Applicant requests that the Section 103 rejection be withdrawn.

In addition, as is well established, obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the cited art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive supporting the combination. None of Snyder, Bonstein and Sugimura, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a thrust link connector including an inner surface having a plurality of threads extending radially outward into a connector opening such that the threads are axially spaced substantially constant along the inner surface, wherein the plurality of threads include a first thread portion positioned proximate the first side and initially engaging a threaded apparatus coupled to the connector, and wherein the plurality of threads include a cutback that extends through the first thread portion.

If art "teaches away" from a claimed invention, such a teaching supports the nonobviousness of the invention. U.S. v. Adams, 148 USPQ 479 (1966); Gillette Co. v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc., 16 USPQ2d 1923, 1927 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In light of this standard, it is respectfully submitted that the cited are, as a whole, is not suggestive of the presently claimed invention. Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that Snyder teaches away from both Bonstein and Sugimura and the present invention, and as such, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Snyder with either Bonstein or Sugimura. Specifically, Snyder describes a mount for a gearbox accessory that includes a link having a clevis threadably coupled to an end of the link, wherein the clevis includes an opening for receiving a mounting plate therein, and a bolt hole for receiving a bolt to attach the clevis to the mounting plate, Bonstein describes a lock nut that is formed by extending a substantially cylindrical bore through a nut blank to form a plurality of substantially-identical threads therein, and Sugimura describes a vessel body formed with an internal-pressure bearing female screw that includes a plurality of female screw threads formed with a constant axial spacing along the female screw.

In addition, none of Snyder, Bonstein and Sugimura describe or suggest a thrust link connector including an inner surface having a plurality of threads extending radially outward into a connector opening such that the threads are axially spaced substantially constant along the inner surface, wherein the plurality of threads include a first thread portion positioned proximate the first side and initially engaging a threaded apparatus coupled to the connector, and wherein the plurality of threads include a cutback that extends through the first thread portion.

Moreover, and to the extent understood, none of Snyder, Bonstein and Sugimura describe or suggest the claimed invention. Specifically, Claim 13 recites "a gas turbine engine comprising a thrust link comprising a first connector, a second connector, and a span section extending therebetween, each said thrust link connector comprising a first side, a second side, and an opening extending therebetween and defined by an inner surface, said inner surface comprising a plurality of threads extending radially outward into said connector opening such that said threads are axially spaced substantially constant along said inner surface, said plurality of threads comprises a first thread portion positioned proximate said first side and initially engaging a threaded apparatus coupled to said connector, said plurality of threads comprising a cutback configured to reduce stresses induced into said plurality of threads wherein said cutback extends through said first thread portion."

None of Snyder, Corrette and Fredd, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a gas turbine engine as recited in Claim 13. More specifically, none of Snyder, Corrette and Fredd, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a thrust link connector including an inner surface having a plurality of threads extending radially outward into a connector opening such that the threads are axially spaced substantially constant along the inner surface, wherein the plurality of threads include a first thread portion positioned proximate the first side and initially engaging a threaded apparatus coupled to the connector, wherein the plurality of threads include a cutback that extends through the first thread portion.

Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Snyder describes a mount for a gearbox accessory that includes a link having a clevis threadably coupled to an end of the link, wherein the clevis includes an opening for receiving a mounting plate therein, and a bolt hole for receiving a bolt to attach the clevis to the mounting plate, Bonstein describes a lock nut that is formed by extending a substantially cylindrical bore through a nut blank to form a plurality of substantially-identical threads therein, and Sugimura describes a vessel body formed with an internal-pressure bearing female screw that includes a plurality of female screw threads formed with a constant axial spacing along the female screw. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 13 is submitted to be patentable over Snyder in view of either Bonstein or Sugimura.

Claims 14-20 depend from independent Claim 13. When the recitations of Claims 14-20 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 13, Applicant submits that dependent Claims 14-20 likewise are patentable over Snyder in view of either Bonstein or Sugimura.

The rejection of Claims 12-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Nash et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,571,936) ("Nash")in view of Snyder et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,357,220) ("Snyder") in view of any of Corrette (U.S. Patent No. 4,408,418), Fredd (U.S. Patent No. 4,117,563), Bonstein (U.S. Patent No. 5,014,411), or Sugimura (U.S. Patent No. 4,958,973) is respectfully traversed.

Snyder, Corrette, Fredd, Bonstein and Sugimura are each described above. Nash describes a structural member 106 including a body portion 200 and a pair of link terminals 204 and 206 located on opposing end of body portion 200. Link terminals 202 and 204 include threaded shaft portions 210 and 212, respectively, that are coupled to tapped holes 206 and 208 located at the ends of body portion 200. Link terminals 202 and 204 also include captive ball members 222 and 224, respectively, having holes 230 and 232 extending therethrough for receiving fastening members.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Section 103 rejection of the presently pending claims is not a proper rejection. As is well established, obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the cited art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive supporting the combination. None of Nash, Snyder, Corrette, Fredd, Bonstein and Sugimura, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest the claimed combination. Furthermore, in contrast to the assertion within the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that it would not be obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Nash with Snyder and any of Corrette, Fredd, Bonstein and Sugimura, because there is no motivation to combine the references suggested in the art. Additionally, the Examiner has not pointed to any prior art that teaches or suggests to combine the disclosures, other than Applicant's own teaching. Rather, only the conclusory statements that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the inner surface threaded" and "it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a cutback, as taught by any of Corrette, Fredd, Bonstein or Sugimura, in order to facilitate an enhanced threaded connection..." suggests combining the disclosures.

As the Federal Circuit has recognized, obviousness is not established merely by combining references having different individual elements of pending claims. Ex parte Levengood, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1300 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993). MPEP 2143.01. Rather, there must be some suggestion, outside of Applicant's disclosure, in the prior art to combine such references, and a reasonable expectation of success must be both found in the prior art, and not based on Applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck , 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1436 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In the present case, neither a suggestion or motivation to combine the prior art disclosures, nor any reasonable expectation of success has been shown.

Furthermore, it is impermissible to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or "template" to piece together the teachings of the cited art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious. Specifically, one cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the art to deprecate the claimed invention. Further, it is impermissible to pick and choose from any one reference only so much of it as will support a given position, to the exclusion of other parts necessary to the full appreciation of what such reference fairly suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art. The present Section 103 rejection is based on a combination of teachings selected from multiple patents in an attempt to arrive at the claimed invention. Specifically, Nash is cited for its teaching of a gas turbine engine including a structural member having a link terminals having holes extending therethrough for receiving fastening members, Snyder is merely cited for its teaching threading the inner surface of mounting links, Corrette, Fredd, Bonstein and Sugimura are each merely cited for teaching of a plurality of threads including a cutback. Since there is no teaching nor suggestion in the cited art for the combination, the Section 103 rejection appears to be based on a hindsight reconstruction in which isolated disclosures have been picked and chosen in an attempt to deprecate the present invention. Of course, such a combination is impermissible, and for this reason alone, Applicant requests that the Section 103 rejection be withdrawn.

In addition, as is well established, obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the cited art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive supporting the combination. None of Nash, Snyder, Corrette, Fredd, Bonstein and Sugimura, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a thrust link connector including an inner surface having a plurality of threads extending radially outward into a connector opening such that the threads are axially spaced substantially constant along the inner surface, wherein the plurality of threads include a first thread portion positioned proximate the first side and initially engaging a threaded apparatus coupled to the connector, and wherein the plurality of threads include a cutback that extends through the first thread portion.

If art "teaches away" from a claimed invention, such a teaching supports the nonobviousness of the invention. U.S. v. Adams, 148 USPQ 479 (1966); Gillette Co. v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc., 16 USPQ2d 1923, 1927 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In light of this standard, it is respectfully submitted that the cited are, as a whole, is not suggestive of the presently claimed invention. Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that Nash teaches away from Snyder, Corrette, Fredd, Bonstein and Sugimura, and the present invention, and as such, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Snyder with either Corrette or Fredd. Specifically, Nash describes a structural member including a body portion and a pair of link terminals including captive ball members having holes extending therethrough for receiving fastening members, Snyder describes a mount for a gearbox accessory that includes a link having a clevis threadably coupled to an end of the link, wherein the clevis includes an opening for receiving a mounting plate therein, and a bolt hole for receiving a bolt to attach the clevis to the mounting plate, Corrette describes a through-feed rolling of a workpiece with cylindrical through-feed rolling dies formed with threads extending from a lead-in taper portion, a uniform dwell portion, and an exit taper portion, Fredd describes a thread chaser tool for cutting thread forms in a tubular member having both straight threads and tapered threads, Bonstein describes a lock nut that is formed by extending a substantially cylindrical bore through a nut blank to form a plurality of substantially-identical threads therein, and Sugimura describes a vessel body formed with an internal-pressure bearing female screw that includes a plurality of female screw threads formed with a constant axial spacing along the female screw.

In addition, none of Nash, Snyder, Corrette, Fredd, Bonstein and Sugimura describe or suggest a thrust link connector including an inner surface having a plurality of threads extending radially outward into a connector opening such that the threads are axially spaced substantially constant along the inner surface, wherein the plurality of threads include a first thread portion positioned proximate the first side and initially engaging a threaded apparatus coupled to the connector, and wherein the plurality of threads include a cutback that extends through the first thread portion.

Moreover, and to the extent understood, none of Nash, Snyder, Corrette, Fredd, Bonstein and Sugimura, describe or suggest the claimed invention. Specifically, Claim 13 recites "a gas turbine engine comprising a thrust link comprising a first connector, a second connector, and a span section extending therebetween, each said thrust link connector comprising a first side, a second side, and an opening extending therebetween and defined by an inner surface, said inner surface comprising a plurality of threads extending radially outward into said connector opening such that said threads are axially spaced substantially constant along said inner surface, said plurality of threads comprises a first thread portion positioned proximate said first side and initially engaging a threaded apparatus coupled to said connector, said plurality of threads comprising a cutback configured to reduce stresses induced into said plurality of threads wherein said cutback extends through said first thread portion."

None of Snyder, Corrette and Fredd, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a gas turbine engine as recited in Claim 13. More specifically, none of Snyder, Corrette and Fredd, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a thrust link connector including an inner surface having a plurality of threads extending radially outward into a connector opening such that the threads are axially spaced substantially constant along the inner surface, wherein the plurality of threads include a first thread portion positioned proximate the first side and initially engaging a threaded apparatus coupled to the connector, and wherein the plurality of threads include a cutback that extends through the first thread portion.

Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Nash describes a structural member including a body portion and a pair of link terminals including captive ball members having holes extending therethrough for receiving fastening members, Snyder describes a mount for a gearbox accessory that includes a link having a clevis threadably coupled to an end of the link, wherein the clevis includes an opening for receiving a mounting plate therein, and a bolt hole for receiving a bolt to attach the clevis to the mounting plate, Corrette describes a through-feed rolling of a workpiece with cylindrical through-feed rolling dies formed with threads extending from a lead-in taper portion, a uniform dwell portion, and an exit taper portion, Fredd describes a thread chaser tool for cutting thread forms in a tubular member having both straight threads and tapered threads, Bonstein describes a lock nut that is formed by extending a substantially cylindrical bore through a nut blank to form a plurality of substantially-identical threads therein, and Sugimura describes a vessel body formed with an internal-pressure bearing female screw that includes a plurality of female screw threads formed with a constant axial spacing along the female screw. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 13 is submitted to be patentable over Nash in view of Snyder in view of any of Corrette, Fredd, Bonstein or Sugimura.

Claims 14-20 depend from independent Claim 13. When the recitations of Claims 14-20 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 13, Applicant submits that dependent Claims 14-20 likewise are patentable over Nash in view of Snyder in view of any of Corrette, Fredd, Bonstein or Sugimura.

Claim 12 has been cancelled.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 12-20 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert B. Reeser III
Registration No. 45,548
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070